

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 BRIAN HEBERT,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 THE LITIGATION DOCUMENT GROUP, *et*
11 *al.*,

12 Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-01536-KJD-CWH

ORDER

13
14 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (#48) of
15 Magistrate Judge Carl W. Hoffman entered October 30, 2018, recommending that Defendants'
16 Motion for Leave to Amend Answer (#42) be denied. Though the time for doing so has passed,
17 Defendants have failed to file any objections to the Report and Recommendation.

18 The Court has conducted a de novo review of the record in this case in accordance with
19 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and LR IB 3-1. The Court finds that the Magistrate's Order (#48) is
20 neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a). See
21 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). This Court does not have a definite and firm conviction that a mistake
22 has been made. See Weeks v. Samsung Heavy Indus. Co. Ltd., 126 F.3d 926, 943 (7th Cir.
23 1997). The Court determines that the Report and Recommendation (#48) of the United States
24 Magistrate Judge entered October 30, 2018, should be **ADOPTED** and **AFFIRMED**.

25 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and
26 Recommendation (#48) entered October 30, 2018, are **ADOPTED** and **AFFIRMED**;

27 ///

28 ///

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant's Motion for Leave to Amend Answer
2 (#42) is **DENIED**.

3 Dated this 19th day of December, 2018.

4 

5 _____
6 Kent J. Dawson
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28